

REMARKS

Claims 36-38 and 40-45 stand withdrawn as the result of a restriction requirement.

Claims 24-35 and 39 are pending for further examination.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for recognizing that claims 27 and 35 recite allowable subject matter.

Claims 24-26, 28-34 and 39 were rejected as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,769,412 (Takemoto et al.).

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

Claim 1 has been clarified to recite moving at least one of three points frictionally engaging the banknote in a direction of intended movement of the banknote. The at least one point moves to convey the banknote against a reference surface in the intended direction of movement of the banknote.

In the illustrated example, the direction of movement is indicated by arrow 22 (Fig. 2), and the reference surface 36 (Fig. 3) against which the banknote is conveyed is oriented in the same direction.

The invention can address the problem of banknotes with low rigidity folding up when conveyed against an aligning surface rather than rotating, which can cause a jam. The inventors have recognized that if the banknote is bent during transport, the amount of the conveying force depends (at least in part) on the rigidity of the banknote. In this way, higher rigidity banknotes are conveyed against the aligning surface with more force than lower rigidity banknotes, which allows good operation with reduced risk of jamming.

In contrast to claim 1, the Takemoto et al. patent discloses a bill (S) that is moved vertically through inlet 14. The bill comes into contact with the bottom board 13 of storage chamber 10. The bottom board 13, however, is oriented perpendicular to the bill's direction of

Likewise, claim 39 recites a banknote conveyor for conveying a banknote along a direction of intended movement. The banknote is aligned by conveying the banknote against a

reference surface *orientated in the intended direction of travel* of the banknote so that the banknote rotates.


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicant requests allowance of claims 24-35 and 39.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/1/08



Samuel Borodach
Reg. No. 38,388

Fish & Richardson P.C.
Citigroup Center
52nd Floor
153 East 53rd Street
Previously presented York, Previously presented York 10022-4611
Telephone: (212) 765-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945